



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/745,897	12/21/2000	Yoshihiro Satoh	JA999745	2636

7590 11/17/2003

Blanche E. Schiller, Esq.  
HESLIN & ROTHENBERG, P.C.  
5 Columbia Circle  
Albany, NY 12203

EXAMINER

MAHMOUDI, HASSAN

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2175

DATE MAILED: 11/17/2003

9

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

21

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/745,897

Applicant(s)

SATOH, YOSHIHIRO

Examiner

Tony Mahmoudi

Art Unit

2175

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 September 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☒ The proposed drawing correction filed on 17 September 2003 is: a) ☒ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121. DOV POPOVICI

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**  
**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100**

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Remarks*

1. In response to communications filed on 17-September-2003, claims 1-9 are presently pending in the application.
2. The drawing correction filed on 17-September-2003 is approved by the examiner.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bapat et al (U.S. patent No. 6,236,996) in view of Celik (U.S. patent No. 6,374,259.)

As to claim 1, Bapat et al teaches a computer system for controlling access to data to be used in common by multiple users (see Abstract, and see column 32, lines 35-42), comprising:

data storage for storing the data in common (see column 7, lines 37-38, and see column 32, lines 37-40);

Art Unit: 2175

an access management table including access management data to control an access right to the data in common (see column 3, lines 31-41, where “access management table” is read on “permission table”); and

control means (see column 3, lines 15-17) for automatically updating the access management data (see column 18, lines 36-40) in the access management table (see column 4, lines 53-54, and see column 8, lines 35-40), concurrent with and in response to transmitting a communication (see column 15, line 67 through column 16, line 7, where “concurrent with” is read on “virtually simultaneously”, and “transmitting communication” is read on “receiving any event notification”, and see column 16, lines 55-61), in which reference information to the data in common are included (see column 8, lines 37-41, where “data in common” is read on “shared with other servers”), wherein the user is granted the access right to the data pursuant to the automatic updating of the access management data responsive to the transmitting of the communication (see column 13, lines 17-30.)

Bapat et al does not teach a first user who is authorized to grant an access right to the data to a second user; and wherein the second user is granted the access rights.

Celik teaches storage and retrieval of business contact information (see Abstract), in which he teaches a first user who is authorized to grant an access right to the data to a second user (see Abstract, and see column 1, lines 50-58, and see column 11, lines 51-57); and wherein the second user is granted the access rights (see Abstract, and see column 2, lines 38-46.)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Bapat et al to include a first user who is

Art Unit: 2175

authorized to grant an access right to the data to a second user; and wherein the second user is granted the access rights.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Bapat et al by the teachings of Celik, because a first user who is authorized to grant an access right to the data to a second user; and wherein the second user is granted the access rights, would enable select users (master users) to grant access rights and be able to control (modify and/or revoke) such access rights to other users, in order to share contents within a distributed database system.

As to claim 2, Bapat et al as modified teaches wherein the access management data in the access management table (see Bapat et al, column 3, lines 31-41, where “access management table” is read on “permission table”) includes identification information for data to be accessed (see Bapat et al, column 3, lines 26-30, where “identification information for data to be accessed” is read on “management information for corresponding managed objects”), identification information for the second user to whom the access right to the data has been granted (see Celik, column 2, lines 9-17), and access level information (see Bapat et al, column 12, line 58 through column 13, line 3.)

As to claim 3, Bapat et al as modified teaches wherein the access management data in the access management table (see Bapat et al, column 3, lines 31-41, where “access management table” is read on “permission table”) includes identification information for the first user who grants the access right to the second user (see Celik, column 1, lines 50-57.)

As to claim 4, Bapat et al as modified teaches wherein the control means (see Bapat et al, column 3, lines 15-17) automatically updates the access management data (see Bapat et al, column 18, lines 36-40) in response to a command (see Bapat et al, column 18, lines 1-9) that is automatically issued during the transmitting of the communication (see Bapat et al, column 15, line 67 through column 16, line 7, where “transmitting of the communication” is read on “receiving any event notification”, and see column 16, lines 55-61.)

As to claim 5, Bapat et al as modified teaches the computer system further comprising:  
a plurality of user terminals for communicating with the computer system (see Bapat et al, column 16, lines 58-61, where “plurality of user terminals” is read on “user workstations 300”).

As to claims 6 and 7, Bapat et al as modified teaches wherein the control means automatically updates the access management data (see Bapat et al, column 18, lines 36-40) in response to a command that 's automatically issued during the transmitting of the communication (see Bapat et al, column 15, line 67 through column 16, line 7, where “transmitting of the communication” is read on “receiving any event notification”, and see column 16, lines 55-61.)

As to claim 8, Bapat et al teaches a communication system (see Abstract, and see column 7, lines 39-41) comprising:

Art Unit: 2175

a computer system for controlling access to data to be used in common by multiple users (see Abstract, and see column 32, lines 35-42), comprising:

data storage for storing the data in common (see column 7, lines 37-38, and see column 32, lines 37-40);

an access management table including access management data to control an access right to the data in common (see column 3, lines 31-41, where “access management table” is read on “permission table”); and

control means (see column 3, lines 15-17) for automatically updating the access management data (see column 18, lines 36-40) in the access management table (see column 4, lines 53-54, and see column 8, lines 35-40), concurrent with and in response to transmitting a communication (see column 15, line 67 through column 16, line 7, where “concurrent with” is read on “virtually simultaneously”, and “transmitting communication” is read on “receiving any event notification”, and see column 16, lines 55-61), in which reference information to the data in common are included (see column 8, lines 37-41, where “data in common” is read on “shared with other servers”), wherein the user is granted the access right to the data pursuant to the automatic updating of the access management data responsive to the transmitting of the communication (see column 13, lines 17-30); and

a plurality of user terminals for communicating with the computer system (see column 16, lines 58-61, where “plurality of user terminals” is read on “user workstations 300”).

Bapat et al does not teach a first user who is authorized to grant an access right to the data to a second user; and wherein the second user is granted the access rights.

Art Unit: 2175

Celik teaches storage and retrieval of business contact information (see Abstract), in which he teaches a first user who is authorized to grant an access right to the data to a second user (see Abstract, and see column 1, lines 50-58, and see column 11, lines 51-57); and wherein the second user is granted the access rights (see Abstract, and see column 2, lines 38-46.)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Bapat et al to include a first user who is authorized to grant an access right to the data to a second user; and wherein the second user is granted the access rights.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Bapat et al by the teachings of Celik, because a first user who is authorized to grant an access right to the data to a second user; and wherein the second user is granted the access rights, would enable select users (master users) to grant access rights and be able to control (modify and/or revoke) such access rights to other users, in order to share contents within a distributed database system.

As to claim 9, Bapat et al as modified teaches access management table (see Bapat et al, column 3, lines 31-41, where “access management table” is read on “permission table”.)

Bapat et al as modified still does not teach wherein the access management table resides on a server external to the first user and the second user.

Celik teaches storage and retrieval of business contact information (see Abstract), in which he teaches wherein the access management table resides on a server external to the

Art Unit: 2175

first user and the second user (see figure 2B, where “access management table” resides on “Web Database 18”, which is external to “user 1 PC 12” and also external to user 2 PC 14”.)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Bapat et al as modified to include wherein the access management table resides on a server external to the first user and the second user.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Bapat et al as modified, with the teaching of Celik, because the access management table residing on a server external to the first user and the second user, would result in the access control/management means to run independently from any users’ computer, which would result in a more efficient distributed access control system, in which users can provide access authorization to one another, and in which any user’s access could be revoked by the access management system (residing in an external system) without dependencies of the access management system on any one user’s computer.

### *Response to Arguments*

5. Applicant's arguments filed on 17-September-2003 with respect to the rejected claims in view of the cited references have been fully considered but they are not found persuasive:

In response to applicant’s arguments that “applicants recite automatically updating the access management data in the access management table concurrent with the transmission of

Art Unit: 2175

a communication that includes reference information to the data to be used in common” and that “Bapat discloses no such concurrency”), the arguments have been fully considered but are not found persuasive, because Bapat et al teaches: “Furthermore, the access restrictions imposed by the DBMS 280 are automatically updated whenever the access rights to the corresponding event notifications are modified in the main access control engine that controls access to information in the managed object tree” (see column 18, lines 36-40.)

In response to applicant’s arguments that “the granting of access rights by database updates in Bapat is done before reference information is transmitted”, the arguments have been fully considered but are not found persuasive, because Bapat et al, in claim 1 of his invention teaches: “instructions for retrieving management information from the managed objects, *in response to user access requests*, the retrieving instructions including instructions for granting and denying access requests in accordance with the access rights information stored in the access control database” (see column 32, lines 49-54, where “in response to access request” indicates that it is done after information is transmitted.)

In response to the applicant’s arguments that “like Bapat, Celik grants rights by database updates prior to the transmission of reference information”, the arguments have been fully considered but are not found persuasive because the examiner is relying on the primary reference, Bapat et al, for this teaching as explained above.

Art Unit: 2175

*Conclusion*

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

7. Any inquiries concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tony Mahmoudi whose telephone number is (703) 305-4887. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays-Fridays from 08:00 am to 04:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dov Popovici, can be reached at (703) 305-3830.

tm

November 3, 2003



DOV POPOVICI  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100